

## **CLUSTER: PARENT INVOLVEMENT**

OBJECTIVE: Provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to children with disabilities is facilitated through parent involvement in special education services.

### Notes:

- Components and indicators marked with an “\*” are included in Cluster Lite.
- Related professional development is listed under the indicators. For descriptions of the professional development, please refer to the Comprehensive System of Professional Development section.
- General notes about the data analyzed in this report can be found in the Data Explanations section.

## COMPONENT BP.1\*: Are parents involved in determining appropriate services for their children?

**Overview Answer:** Overall, there is an acceptable level of involvement of parents in determining appropriate services for their children. The additional data gathering that is in process will better inform this component.

Parents of older students with disabilities who participated in the focus groups reported that they were very involved in determining appropriate services for their children. They believed that they had learned more about actively participating in the individualized education program (IEP) process as time went on. While the parents of younger students with disabilities reported that they were involved in the IEP process, many requested additional training on what the possibilities were for their children so they would be better prepared to be a more integral part of the process.

**Strengths:** During focus groups, parents stated that they were very involved and desired to understand even more to continue to be involved. Monitoring data reflects that parents are involved in determining appropriate services for their children. The responses from the Special Education Parent Survey present a generally positive picture of the delivery of special education services in Missouri. Parents report they participate in the decisions made regarding their children's education and that they are generally satisfied with the delivery of special education services, they report that districts schedule IEP meetings at convenient times, and that the process of determining what special education services their children need is open and accessible. Parents report receiving required procedural safeguards information and participating in discussions about having their children receive special education services in regular classrooms. The respondents to the Special Education Parent Survey have similar participation rates in school events and have similar opinions about their schools, as do respondents to the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Parent Advanced Questionnaire. These opinions are generally positive, suggesting that most parents are satisfied with the instruction their children receive and their school environment.

**Areas of Concern:** Parents still have a low level of trust in schools and the process. The process is complicated and causes difficulty in communicating the process to parents, and since the process is dictated by legislation and regulations, simplifying the process is under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Schools are searching for additional strategies to involve parents in determining appropriate services for their children.

**Other Comments:** Recommendations have been made by the committee regarding gathering additional data to inform this question and to help develop strategies to involve parents in their children's education. There are concerns about the complexity of the law and of the process as this puts a burden on school personnel as the staff attempts to be conscientious in explaining the process to parents.

Other committee recommendations include:

- Providing training to the districts and parents on strategies from effective schools that help increase performance results
- Developing a model based on research of what other states have done to promote collaboration and team building between parents/district/state stakeholders
- Making training available that is more than a one-time training, but an ongoing in-service opportunity for learning and practice with follow along, technical assistance and videotape support or other devices of support to the district
- Identifying Institute of Higher Education (IHE) pre-service training needs to encourage parent involvement and collaborative teaming with parents
- Developing a best practices standardized format for reporting progress to parents that will drive the process
- Linking parent information to the performance goals so that parents see this information as a resource to increase students' performance. This is true especially in the area of district and statewide assessments.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.1.1:</b> Are parents actively involved in decision-making for their children?</p> <p><b>Data Sources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring data</li> <li>• Focus group data</li> <li>• Parent survey data</li> <li>• MSIP Advanced Questionnaire data</li> <li>• Evaluation of local parent training</li> </ul> <p><b>Related CSPD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autism – Project Access</li> <li>• Assistive Technology</li> <li>• First Steps Bulletins</li> <li>• Missouri Parents Act</li> <li>• Missouri School for the Blind Outreach</li> <li>• Missouri School for the Deaf Outreach</li> <li>• New Scripts Early Interventions/ Early Childhood Systems Change in Personnel Preparation</li> <li>• Parent Advisory Council Training</li> <li>• Parents Roles Brochures</li> <li>• Parents as Teachers: Supporting Families of Children with Special Needs Guide and Training</li> <li>• Perspectives on Emotional and Behavioral Disorders</li> <li>• Practical Parenting Partnerships</li> <li>• Secondary Transition – Building Bridges</li> <li>• Surrogate Parent Training</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Monitoring Data</b></p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard <b>Evaluation-4</b> – Parents are afforded the opportunity to provide information that is used in the evaluations: 27 of 94, 28.72 percent of agencies noncompliant The majority of noncompliant districts were found out of compliance due to lack of documentation indicating that existing evaluation data on the child was reviewed for initial evaluations or reevaluations.</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard <b>Evaluation-7</b> – Parents and children with disabilities are involved, when appropriate, in the evaluation and eligibility determination: 37 of 94, 39.36 percent of agencies noncompliant Districts were found out of compliance with this standard for a variety of reasons, including the lack of documentation indicating that exiting evaluation data on the child was reviewed appropriately. Nine districts were called out on this standard because parents were not informed of the purpose of a meeting.</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard <b>Least Restrictive Environment-7</b> – Parents and children with disabilities are involved, when appropriate, in placement decisions: 12 of 94, 12.77 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard <b>Procedural Safeguards-2</b> – Prior written notice is provided to parents and children, when appropriate, as required by state and federal regulations: 42 of 94, 44.68 percent of agencies noncompliant Twenty-six of the forty-two noncompliant districts failed to provide or failed to document the provision of Prior Written Notice to parents for any change of services.</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 104510</b> – Parent informed of all purposes of the meeting: 16 of 94, 17.02 percent noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 108600</b> – Content of progress report in individualized education program (IEP): 22 of 94, 23.40 percent noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 108610</b> – IEP addresses the progress toward the annual goals: 14 of 94, 14.89 percent noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 108620</b> – IEP addresses Likelihood of achievement by the end of year: 26 of 93, 27.96 percent noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 108700</b> – Parent is provided copy of the IEP: 17 of 94, 18.09 percent noncompliant</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.1.1:</b> Continued</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Focus Group Summary</b></p> <p>Many parents reported that they were actively involved in decision-making for their children. However, some parents felt that they did not know enough about the school system and the range of possibilities for their children so they often let the school personnel determine the appropriate services for their children. Parents who reported that they felt unprepared to be a totally active participant requested training on the individualized education program (IEP) process and about the range of possibilities for their children. Some the parents had concerns about how they were perceived and treated by educators. Barriers such as, “educators that are resistant to parental involvement/input,” “schools don’t trust knowledge of parents,” and “teachers’ resistance to any modifications” were comments that were expressed and verified by many of the participants. Other concerns expressed were, “There is no cooperation between special education teachers and regular education teachers,” “lack of understanding/empathy of how important inclusion is for children” and “attitude, administrative bullying,” etc. The latter are areas that will be given consideration during improvement planning discussions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Parent Survey Results</b></p> <p>Over ninety percent of parents agree or “strongly agree” with the statement “In IEP meetings, I participate in the decisions made regarding my children’s education.” Over eighty-five percent of parents agree or “strongly agree” with the statement, “I am satisfied with the IEP process.” Parents agree that their school districts schedule IEP meetings at convenient times and places, that their districts notify parents of IEP and other meetings and that parents participate in the educational decisions effecting their children.</p> <p>Results show parent agreement with two statements, “My school’s principal encourages me to participate in the educational decisions affecting my children” and “My children’s teachers encourage me to participate in the educational decisions affecting them.” Both of these results show a high percentage of agreement, suggesting that parents feel they have input into the educational decisions made on behalf of their children.</p> <p>Generally, parents say they talk to their children’s regular teachers more often than they talk to their children’s special education teachers. These differences are slight, for example, 36.2 percent of parents of children in elementary school report talking to regular education teachers more than ten times, while 24.4 percent report talking to their special education teachers as frequently.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MSIP Advanced Questionnaire Results</b></p> <p>Responses from parents of students with disabilities statewide (rating scale range is strongly disagree to strongly agree, (n is approximately 37,500):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers inform me about what my child will be studying: 67.8 percent agreed or strongly agreed</li> <li>2. The curriculum at this school meets the needs of my child: 67.7 percent agreed or strongly agreed</li> <li>3. I can talk with my child’s teachers or principal whenever I need: 86.7 percent agreed or strongly agreed</li> <li>4. The school encourages parents to be involved: 81.7 percent agreed or strongly agreed</li> <li>5. The school seeks parents’ opinions about educational programs: 45 percent agreed or strongly agreed, 37.1 percent were neutral.</li> </ol>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.1.1:</b> Concluded</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Evaluation of Local Parent Trainings</b></p> <p>Training was conducted by parent/educator teams as required by the Local Improvement Grants (LIG)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On a four point scale, 44 of 60 respondents statewide rated the information provided in the workshop as “meaningful,” 14 of 60 rated the information as having “some meaning,” and 2 of 60 as having “little meaning”</li> <li>2. Thirty-seven of 60 respondents “agreed,” 17 of 60 “agreed somewhat” and 6 of 60 respondents “agreed a little” that they had learned new information, ideas, or skills.</li> </ol> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b></p> <p>Based on surveys, parents are satisfied with the IEP process and are encouraged by administrators and teachers to participate in educational decisions affecting their children. The majority of parents say that they talk with their children’s regular and special education teachers at least three times a year, and some make more than ten contacts in a year. No data sources specifically indicate if parents are actively involved in decision making for their children. Neither the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Advanced Questionnaire nor the Evaluation of Local Parent Trainings indicate specifically if parents were involved in decision-making for their child.</p> <p>The committee defines “actively involved” as being a contributing team member to the special education process, having a proficient level of understanding about their rights and responsibilities, and believing their contribution in decision-making resulted in improvements to the educational environment and student outcomes for their student. Being actively involved as team members is more than just being involved in trainings.</p> <p>Sources are limited to parent perceptions on whether school districts encourage parent communication with school district staff, and not, in the opinion of this committee, what is expected to occur regarding parent involvement in making decisions about their child’s educational environment or services.</p>
<p><b>BP.1.2:</b> Are parents of children with disabilities informed of progress at least as often as their non-disabled peers?</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State monitoring data</li> <li>• Focus group data</li> <li>• MSIP Advanced Questionnaire</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Monitoring Data</b></p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 108500</b> – A statement of how the child’s progress will be reported to the parent (including how the child’s parent will be regularly informed of their child’s progress toward meeting the annual goal(s) and how often this reporting will occur), with the understanding that reporting to parents of children with disabilities must be at least as frequent as progress is reported to the parents of non-disabled children: 13 of 94, 13.83 percent of agencies are noncompliant.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.1.2:</b> Concluded</p> <p><b>Related CSPD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin</li> <li>• Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Focus Group Summary</b></p> <p>The parents in the focus group reported that they were informed of their children’s progress at least as often as their non-disabled peers but most wanted even more communication from the teachers. While some parents said that they understood the huge paperwork responsibilities of the teachers, others wanted as much as daily communication from these same teachers who are already burdened with paperwork overload. The following comment reflects that spoken by many of the participating parents, “Adopt laws that are less paperwork intensive and more student outcome based.” The parents believe such a change would allow teachers more time with the students.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Advanced Questionnaire Results</b></p> <p>I receive regular communications from school about how well my child is doing in school: 75.74 percent of parents of students with disabilities and 74.03 percent of parents of regular education students agreed or strongly agreed. Data from spring of the 2000-2001 and autumn of the 2001-2002 school years.</p> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b></p> <p>Monitoring and parent questionnaire data indicates that parents of children with disabilities are informed of progress at least as often as their non-disabled peers.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.1.3:</b> Do parents understand the individualized education program (IEP) process and services in order to be able to interpret the progress data?</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus group data</li> </ul> <p><b>Related CSPD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autism – Project Access</li> <li>• Missouri Parents’ Act</li> <li>• Parents Roles Brochures</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Focus Group Summary</b></p> <p>The parents in the focus groups varied from those who said they understood the IEP process and services to those who said they did not understand the IEP process at all. Many parents requested additional training on the IEP process so they could better understand all that is involved and thus become more active participants. It was unclear how many parents would avail themselves of the services as many noted that it was often inconvenient for them to participate in IEP meetings even when the school personnel made every attempt to work with the parents’ work schedules. One of the principals in a focus group said that he realized that many parents did not understand the IEP process fully so he made it a point to be involved in every IEP meeting. Whenever he felt that the parents were not understanding the points being made, he asked questions as though he didn’t understand the points so that the other personnel involved in the IEP meeting would have to reiterate the points. He found this to be very effective.</p> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b></p> <p>The committee was unable to determine if parents understand the IEP process. Focus group results included a range of understanding. Additional analysis is needed in this area.</p>
<p><b>BP.1.4:</b> Are parents informed about parental rights and responsibilities?</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent survey results</li> <li>• Focus group data</li> <li>• Monitoring data</li> </ul> <p><b>Related CSPD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent Advisory Council Training</li> <li>• Parents Role Brochures</li> <li>• Surrogate Parent Training</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Parent Survey Results</b></p> <p>Several questions in the survey asked parents whether they were given the Procedural Safeguards and whether they had an opportunity to discuss their rights with school personnel. Ninety-two percent of all parents report receiving the procedural safeguards booklet and 80.9 percent report having school personnel discuss the content of the booklet and answer their questions, and 77.5 percent report discussing whether their children should receive special education services in regular classrooms. However, only 7.2 percent of parents report having attended any training about their rights or safeguards, and only 45.5 percent of all parents reported having the opportunity to attend such training.</p> <p><b>Focus Group Summary</b></p> <p>All the parents in the focus groups reported that they were given a copy of their procedural safeguards. However, few parents reported reading the safeguards. Most just filed them away. When parents did refer to the procedural safeguards, they were usually under stress due to a concern about their children’s services and they said they found the procedural safeguards confusing and not extremely useful. The state provides the safeguards in the manner mandated by the Office of Special Education Programs and the parents definitely did not find that format “parent friendly.”</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																								
BP.1.4: Continued	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Monitoring Data</b></p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator A 104040.07</b> – Copy of the procedural safeguards statement provided with Prior Written Notice of Reevaluation: 1 of 2, 50.00 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A very small number of districts were monitored under requirement of Provision of Procedural Safeguards with a Notice of Intent to Reevaluate, due to most districts determining in the reevaluation process that no additional data was needed or that the data to be collected did not require the Provision of Notice with Consent.</li></ul> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 100300</b> – Full explanation of all procedural safeguards at referral: 25 of 94, 26.60 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring <b>Indicator B 104570</b> – Parent is provided a copy of Procedural Safeguards with notification of an individualized education program (IEP) meeting: 18 of 93, 19.35 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard <b>Procedural Safeguards-4</b> – Parents and children with disabilities are informed of the transfer of parental rights, when appropriate: 13 of 72, 18.06 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p> <p>Monitoring Indicator 100250 - Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Action Refused</p> <table><tr><th></th><th># Districts monitored on this standard</th><th># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</th></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>20</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>23</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>40</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Monitoring Indicator 100550 - Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Action for Ineligibility</p> <table><tr><th></th><th># Districts monitored on this standard</th><th># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</th></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>67</td><td>9</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>85</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>92</td><td>6</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	20	3	1	0	FY2000	23	1	0		FY2001	40	0				# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	67	9	0		FY2000	85	5	2	Incomplete	FY2001	92	6	Incomplete	
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																																					
FY1999	20	3	1	0																																					
FY2000	23	1	0																																						
FY2001	40	0																																							
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																																					
FY1999	67	9	0																																						
FY2000	85	5	2	Incomplete																																					
FY2001	92	6	Incomplete																																						



LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
BP.1.4: Continued	Monitoring Indicator 100670 - Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Change of Placement at Graduation																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>73</td><td>13</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>80</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>88</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	73	13	1	0	FY2000	80	6	1	Incomplete	FY2001	88	3	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	73	13	1	0																
	FY2000	80	6	1	Incomplete																
	FY2001	88	3	Incomplete																	
	Monitoring Indicator 102110 - Procedural Safeguards provided upon referral for evaluation																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>86</td><td>26</td><td>8</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>105</td><td>37</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>103</td><td>41</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	86	26	8	0	FY2000	105	37	3	Incomplete	FY2001	103	41	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	86	26	8	0																
	FY2000	105	37	3	Incomplete																
	FY2001	103	41	Incomplete																	
	Monitoring Indicator 104250 - Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Change in Services																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>73</td><td>29</td><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>99</td><td>15</td><td>2</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>87</td><td>12</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	73	29	3	0	FY2000	99	15	2	Incomplete	FY2001	87	12	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	73	29	3	0																
	FY2000	99	15	2	Incomplete																
FY2001	87	12	Incomplete																		
Monitoring Indicator 105100 - Procedural Safeguards provided with notification of an IEP meeting																					
<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>93</td><td>27</td><td>5</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>108</td><td>28</td><td>2</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>105</td><td>21</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	93	27	5	0	FY2000	108	28	2	Incomplete	FY2001	105	21	Incomplete		
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																	
FY1999	93	27	5	0																	
FY2000	108	28	2	Incomplete																	
FY2001	105	21	Incomplete																		

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
<b>BP.1.4:</b> Concluded	<p>Monitoring Indicator 106200 - Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice to Reevaluate</p> <table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>85</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>101</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>102</td><td>5</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b> Parent survey results indicate that parents do receive copies of the Procedural Safeguards and that they have the opportunity to discuss the safeguards with district personnel. Monitoring reports indicate that most districts provide notice of procedural safeguards at the required points in the special education process. While documentation of the Provision of Procedural Safeguards may be lacking in initial monitoring reviews, the problems are generally resolved by the time of the first follow-up.</p>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	85	4	1	0	FY2000	101	5	0		FY2001	102	5	Incomplete	
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																	
FY1999	85	4	1	0																	
FY2000	101	5	0																		
FY2001	102	5	Incomplete																		
<b>BP.1.5:</b> How do we know that parents and staff understand the procedural safeguards they are given?  <b>Data Source:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Parent survey data</li><li>• Focus group data</li><li>• Monitoring data</li></ul> <b>Related CSPD:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Autism – Project Access</li></ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Parent Survey Results</b></p> <p>Several questions in the survey asked parents whether they were given the Procedural Safeguards and whether they had an opportunity to discuss their rights with school personnel. Ninety-two percent of all parents report receiving the procedural safeguards booklet and 80.9 percent report having school personnel discuss the content of the booklet and answer their questions, and 77.5 percent report discussing whether their children should receive special education services in regular classrooms. However, only 7.2 percent of parents report having attended any training about their rights or safeguards, and only 45.5 percent of all parents reported having the opportunity to attend such training.</p> <p><b>Focus Group Summary</b></p> <p>Most parents in the focus groups reported that they did not even look at the procedural safeguards document until they ran into a problem. At that point, they found the document confusing. Parents requested that the document be rewritten in easy to understand, perhaps bulleted, format.</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard <b>Procedural Safeguards-1</b> – Individuals responsible for the provision of services to children with disabilities are informed of the Procedural Safeguard rights for parents and children: 19 of 92, 20.65 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b> Data suggests that many parents and staff do not understand the procedural safeguards, and it is likely that considerable work is needed in this area. Parents found the Procedural Safeguards document confusing and suggested it be written in understandable language.</p>																				

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.1.6:</b> Do performance goals and indicators show increased results for students with disabilities?</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biennial Performance Report and Early Entry Profile</li> <li>• Special Education State Profile</li> <li>• Parent Questionnaire from MSIP</li> <li>• Effective Schools Research</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b> The Special Education Advisory Panel's annual report includes data regarding performance of students with disabilities on the eight performance goals for students with disabilities. The report indicates that students are making progress, however a gap continues to exist in most areas between the performance of students with disabilities and all students. (Data is included in other cluster reports.)</p> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b> Neither the Special Education State Profile, Parent Questionnaire from MSIP, the Biennial Performance Report nor the School Entry Profile provides data indicating the effect parent involvement has on student performance. The effective schools research document addresses home/school relations, but we do not have data showing a correlation or cause/effect relationship between the performance of students with disabilities and this effective schools literature. Questions from the MSIP Parent Questionnaire relate to parent perceptions and satisfaction with school districts such as listening to their concerns, and offering the opportunity to parents to contribute opinions, but not with regard to whether or not parents are actively involved (gauge of perceptions, not actual involvement) in improving performance.</p>

## COMPONENT BP.2\*: Are parents involved in program improvement activities?

**Overview Answer:** The committee believes that there is not a common definition of “program improvement” activities. We are concerned about the lack of information relative to program improvement activities, however there is limited information from the focus groups relative to parent participation in improvement activities. At the present time, it is not possible to draw a valid conclusion on this component.

**Strengths:** A growing number of parents are actively involved in program improvement activities both at the state and local levels, and information from Comprehensive School Improvement Plans (CSIP) indicates that parents are involved. Data from the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) reveals that parents of students with disabilities are as involved in program improvement activities as are parents of students who are not disabled. This reflects national trends for all students.

**Areas of Concern:** Principals and Early Childhood Special Education administrators have tried a variety of strategies to involve parents in program improvement activities and have experienced very limited success.

**Other Comments:** Recommendations from the committee include:

- Furthering this issue through marketing so that information about how to get involved is available on a community-wide basis
- Developing a model for involving parents based on research of what other states have done to promote collaboration and team building between parents/district/state stakeholders
- Promoting positive involvement of parents from all racial/ethnic groups and educational backgrounds
- Conducting a targeted follow-up survey to Parent Advisory Council (PAC) districts regarding the scope and impact of the parental involvement in school improvement activities
- Surveying parents on program improvement activities in which they participated to determine if parents’ efforts were valued during their participation in activities, if they believe their involvement made a positive difference in the educational environment and/or student outcomes and what other areas need to be addressed to improve the educational environment and student outcomes
- Surveying parents through local school districts using a standardized format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) to be disseminated at the same time as the MSIP questionnaire
- Making all information from the DESE and DESE contracted projects clear, usable, age-appropriate and linked to improved student outcomes, so as to be understandable to the parent.
- Requiring special education parent advisory councils to advise districts on issues related to improving the educational environment and student outcomes in general rather than focus on topic-specific areas
- Conducting trainings for PAC members and districts about the role of an advisory panel in a Local Educational Agency (LEA)
- Reviewing Summit recommendations regarding PACs.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.2.1:</b> Do positive results increase in surveys from parents who participate on program improvement activities in local educational agencies (LEAs), when available?</p> <p><b>Data Sources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MSIP questionnaire</li> <li>• Parent survey</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Parent Survey Results</b></p> <p>Parents were asked if they participate in any district committees. Only about 11 percent indicated that they do.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Grant Evaluation</b></p> <p>Of the twenty-five districts that returned surveys, twenty-four of those districts established one Parent Advisory Council (PAC) while the remaining district established two. At least half of the PAC members were parents of students with disabilities for eighteen of the twenty-five districts. When asked what activities the PACs had participated in successfully, districts indicated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13 Recommendations regarding special education services to the district</li> <li>21 Suggested training for staff, families, communities</li> <li>11 Establishment of a support group</li> <li>3 Negotiate/reach partnerships with other agencies</li> <li>3 Explored additional funding sources</li> <li>16 Developed long-range plans</li> <li>1 Coordinated District's PACs</li> <li>2 Developed documents</li> <li>1 Donations/Scholarships/Memberships</li> <li>1 GLARRC Parent Focus Group</li> </ul> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b></p> <p>The committee determined that this parent questionnaire that is completed as part of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) does not provide information about actual parent participation in program improvement activities. No other sources appear to exist that would provide this information to the Division. It is recommended that questions be added to future surveys that would reveal positive results of parent participation in program improvement activities.</p> <p>This committee has defined program improvement activities at the LEA as any activities designed to improve the educational environment and student outcomes (i.e. –curriculum activities, professional activities, safety issues, facilities improvement, technology, PTA or PTO participation). The committee encourages LEAs to remember to consider parents and students with disabilities for participation input, but also recognizes that parents of all children would not necessarily be required to be on committees or involved in activities. The committee wants data to be collected that would indicate if there is an increase in parent participation in program improvement activities.</p> <p>Although all parents are surveyed for MSIP, and data is disaggregated regarding how many parents of children with disabilities responded to the questionnaire, the survey does not address participation in program improvement activities, or committees such as curriculum committees and Comprehensive School Improvement Programs (CSIP).</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.2.2:</b> Are parents of students with disabilities participating on any district committees such as curricular, Comprehensive School Improvement Program (CSIP) committees or advisory committees?</p> <p><b>Data Sources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent survey data</li> <li>• Focus group data</li> <li>• Parent Advisory Council (PAC) survey data</li> </ul> <p><b>Related CSPD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAC Training</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Parent Survey Results</b></p> <p>Parents were asked if they participate in any district committees. Only about 11 percent indicated that they do. When asked to list the committees, responses included the following: various parent committees/advisory councils, extracurricular activities, various advisory/strategic planning committees, curriculum development, etc.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Focus Group Summary</b></p> <p>Some parents of students with disabilities are participating on curricular or advisory committees but these parents are often either the parents who are involved in advocacy for children with disabilities or parents who do not work. Most parents in the focus groups reported that they thought it was important for parents to be involved in these committees, but they were not involved for a number of reasons such as the extra demands required of a parent of a student with a disability, participating in individualized education program (IEP) meetings, having more frequent meetings with teachers, the requirements of additional children in the family and both parents working in addition to caring for their children. Principals in focus groups reported that they had employed any number of incentives to get greater parental involvement, but they had met with limited success due to the same reasons reported by the parents. The principals requested getting feedback on any successful strategies other principals had used to secure greater participation by parents. One high school principal said that he had tried everything he knew to get all parents involved – setting a date for a meeting way in advance, setting the day and time for the meeting that parents said would fit into their schedules, sending out the agenda in advance so parents knew how their input would contribute to their children’s education, sending home reminders with the students, making advance phone calls to parents, having food available at the meeting, setting up child care for children, etc. He was only able to attract three parents from the entire high school.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.2.2:</b> Concluded</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Grant Evaluation</b></p> <p>Of the twenty-five districts that returned surveys, twenty-four of those districts established one Parent Advisory Council (PAC) while the remaining district established two. At least half of the PAC members were parents of students with disabilities for eighteen of the twenty-five districts. When asked what activities the PACs had participated in successfully, districts indicated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13 Recommendations regarding special education services to the district</li> <li>21 Suggested training for staff, families, communities</li> <li>11 Establishment of a support group</li> <li>3 Negotiate/reach partnerships with other agencies</li> <li>3 Explored additional funding sources</li> <li>16 Developed long-range plans</li> <li>1 Coordinated District's PACs</li> <li>2 Developed documents</li> <li>1 Donations/Scholarships/Memberships</li> <li>1 GLARRC Parent Focus Group</li> </ul> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b> There is some evidence that parents of students with disabilities are involved in district committees with the potential for program improvement. It is unknown how widespread the parent involvement is, but it is very likely that participation should be encouraged as much as possible. PAC grants are available on a competitive basis with the goal to improve student outcomes through parent involvement.</p>
<p><b>BP.2.3:</b> Do results of program improvement activities reflect the identified needs of parents and children with disabilities?</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAC survey data</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Grant Evaluation</b></p> <p>Of the twenty-five districts that returned surveys, none indicated that they conducted a Parent Needs survey.</p> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b> We are unable to determine if program improvement activities reflect the needs of parents since there isn't data available. (The committee defines the terminology of identified needs of parents as: an expressed opinion from the parent regarding anything that improves the educational environment and student outcomes for their child.)</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p><b>BP.2.4*:</b> Do parents participate in state and local educational agency (LEA) self-assessment processes, advisory panels, steering committees, development of performance goals and indicators, etc.?</p> <p><b>Data Sources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent survey data</li> <li>• State advisory panel roster</li> <li>• Reviewed information about participation on other Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) committees</li> </ul>	<p><b>Data Summary:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Parent Survey Results</b></p> <p>Parents were asked if they participate in any district committees. Only about 11 percent indicated that they do. When asked to list the committees, responses included the following: various parent committees/advisory councils, extracurricular activities, various advisory/strategic planning committees, curriculum development, etc.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>State Advisory Panel</b></p> <p>State advisory panel has thirty-one members of which there are sixteen slots for either parents of students with disabilities or individuals with a disability; membership is on a rotational term basis. For more information on the Panel, refer to the Appendix.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Special Education Summit</b></p> <p>In 1998, the Special Education Summit met and made recommendations to the Special Education Advisory Panel. One of the Summit subcommittees worked to establish Performance Goals and Indicators for Special Education. Each of the ten subcommittees was made up of approximately ten to twelve members of whom two to three were parents.</p> <p><b>Committee Conclusions:</b></p> <p>A limited number of parents do participate in state self-assessment and program improvement processes. No data is available from other DESE committees about parent participation other than through informal interviews. It is unknown if any parents of students with disabilities participate on committees in DESE outside of the Division of Special Education.</p> <p>There are Blind Task Force and Summit rosters. The committee did not look at numbers of parents on these committees.</p>